

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2-5 are pending herein. Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 2-5 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. Although Applicants do not acquiesce to the art-based rejections discussed below, claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form.

1. The Examiner objected to the specification in the first paragraph on page 2 of the Office Action. This objection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to note that the sentence "In the drawings, the same or similar numerical references refer to the same or similar elements" was added to the specification in the previous Amendment. Accordingly, while some reference numerals are present on multiple drawings to aid one skilled in the art with a more solid understanding of the present invention, there may be instances where a particular reference number is described in relation to only one drawing. For example, the first and second input terminals 14, 16 are described in great detail in relation to Fig. 1. The reference numerals 14, 16 are provided in Fig. 2 to aid one skilled in the art to understand the relation of the first and second reactance parts 18, 20 to the overall device shown in Fig. 1 (i.e., through the first and second input terminals 14, 16).

Such a process of including reference numerals to aid in the overall clarity of the drawings is, and should be, common U.S. practice. To completely reiterate a description for each of these reference numerals would result in an excessively cumbersome specification that may actually create ambiguity where someone skilled in the art might look for a reason why the same reference numeral is being defined in more than one location in the specification.

While Applicants appreciate the Examiner's apparently good-intentioned attempt at clarifying the disclosure, Applicants respectfully submit that (1) to add a specific description for each duplicate reference number provided in the drawings or (2) to delete duplicate reference numbers from the drawings, would render the present disclosure much more difficult to understand to one skilled in the art. In light of the

foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the present objection.

2. The rejection of claim 1 under §102(e) over Allison is noted, but deemed moot in view of the cancellation of claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims herein are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to issue a Notice of Allowance for this application in due course.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to confirm receipt and consideration of the Identification of Copending Application filed August 30, 2007.

If the Examiner believes that contact with Applicants' attorney would be advantageous toward the disposition of this case, the Examiner is herein requested to call Applicants' attorney at the phone number noted below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1446.

Respectfully submitted,

September 20, 2007

Date

Timothy D. Evans

Stephen P. Burr
Reg. No. 32,970

Timothy D. Evans
Reg. No. 50,797

SPB/TE/tlp

BURR & BROWN
P.O. Box 7068
Syracuse, NY 13261-7068

Customer No.: 025191
Telephone: (315) 233-8300
Facsimile: (315) 233-8320